

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claim 1 based on the disclosure at page 6, lines 16-18, of the specification.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0222861 (Nishikawa). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Nishikawa was filed March 19, 2003. This application claims priority under 35 USC 119(a) from Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-012381, which was filed January 21, 2003. Because this application is entitled to the filing date of the Japanese priority application that was filed before the filing date of Nishikawa, Nishikawa is not prior art against this application. Applicants attach a sworn translation of the Japanese priority application to this Amendment.

The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn because Nishikawa is not prior art against this application.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2000-195677 (Kodama). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites irradiating with a laser beam a region of the display panel that is away from the foreign substance so that a high resistivity region is formed between the anode layer and the cathode layer and around the foreign substance and further states that the laser beam is not directly incident on the detected foreign substance. Because the claimed method does not allow the laser beam to hit a foreign substance directly, pin hole formation due to the destruction of the foreign substance is avoided. See page 6, lines 18-23, of the specification.

The Examiner contends that paragraph [0081] of Kodama discloses the claimed irradiation of the laser beam. However, Kodama explains that Kodama's foreign substance, such as dust, is irradiated with laser light, contrary to the claim language. See paragraph [0081] of Kodama. Kodama's teachings are contrary to the limitation that the region around the foreign substrate is irradiated with the laser beam while the foreign substrate itself is not hit directly by the laser beam.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) on Kodama should be withdrawn because Kodama does not teach or suggest the claimed irradiation.

The two remaining obviousness rejections rely on Kodama and thus should be withdrawn as well because Kodama does not provide the teachings for which it is cited.

Claims 1-4 have been provisionally rejected for double patenting over claims 10-12 of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/392,258. Applicants note that the Nishikawa publication applied above is from Serial No. 10/392,258, which is now U.S. Patent No. 7,234,984. Applicants file a terminal disclaimer with this Amendment to overcome this double patenting rejection.

In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing Docket No. **606402016100**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 25, 2007

By: 

Barry E. Bretschneider
Registration No. 28,055

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 400
McLean, VA 22102-3915
Telephone: (703) 760-7743
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777